

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
OXFORD DIVISION**

TAMMY WALLS

PLAINTIFF

VS.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:15-CV-178-MPM-SAA

GENCO I, INC.

DEFENDANT

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO STAY

Defendant GENCO I, Inc. seeks to stay all further proceedings, including the case management conference and Rule 16 initial order deadlines, until the court has ruled on its motion to dismiss. Docket 18. Defendant provides no authority or basis upon which this court should stay the proceedings.

Under LOCAL UNIFORM CIVIL RULE 16(B)(3)(B), “filing an immunity defense . . . stays the attorney conference and disclosure requirements and all discovery not related to the issue, pending the court’s ruling on the motion, including any appeal.” The court has reviewed defendant’s motion to dismiss, and the basis of the motion is that plaintiff has not pled any factual allegations that plausibly support an entitlement to relief. Docket 9. Because defendant’s motion to stay is not based on jurisdictional or immunity defenses, the court declines to stay this case. Furthermore, staying a case every time a motion to dismiss is filed would be contrary to the interests of judicial economy and efficiency. It is

ORDERED

that defendant’s motion to stay this case pending a ruling on its motion to dismiss is **DENIED**.

All deadlines and scheduling set forth in the Rule 16 Initial Order remain the same.

This, the 10th day of March, 2014.

/s/ S. Allan Alexander
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE